

Safety and Emergency Response Committee

DSA Advisory Board Final Minutes of Meeting Thursday, May 19, 2005

California Community Colleges Building
1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room B
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

Jo Ann Koplin, Chair
Gale Bate, Vice Chair
Mike Modugno
Henry Reyes
Art Ross

DSA Staff Present

David Thorman, State Architect
Mary Ann Aguayo
David Casey
Dan Levernier
Elizabeth Schroeder

Committee Members Absent

Kennith Hall
Jack McMillan
Steve Newsom
Diane Waters

Others Present

John Ashbee, DGS
Chris Wills, CA Geological Survey

1 Call to Order

2 Committee Chair Jo Ann Koplin called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed
3 everyone. Participants took turns introducing themselves.
4

5 Review of Previous Meeting Minutes and Follow-Up Items

6 Ms. Koplin drew attention to the minutes of the December 1, 2004 meeting, which had
7 already been approved by the Board. She noted the committee talked about developing
8 guidelines for evaluating and designating buildings used as shelters, location and contents
9 of emergency bins on school campuses, and California Department of Education (CDE)
10 publications and programs. She reported that the committee unanimously passed a motion
11 to suggest that the DSA Advisory Board initiate correspondence between DSA and the
12 Office of Emergency Services (OES) regarding the relationship between school district
13 safety plans and the plans of their municipalities and local jurisdictions. The committee
14 also approved another motion to conduct a literature search to identify documents pertinent
15 to sheltering.
16

17 Ms. Koplin said Mr. Henry Reyes, Seismic Safety Commission, announced issuance of a
18 Commission report on the safety of public, private, and charter schools. She noted
19 committee members received copies of the report, and additional copies are available.
20

21 Fifth Annual Disaster Resistant California (DRC) Conference

22 Ms. Koplin reported that this year's three-day Disaster Resistant California Conference
23 ended May 18. She commended Mr. Chris Wills for his interesting workshop presentation.
24 She noted there were other workshop sessions relevant to schools, including discussions
25 of emergency supply bins, school disaster response, and school emergency preparedness
26 best practices. Ms. Koplin offered to provide written materials for the staff to disseminate.
27 She suggested inviting the presenter on best practices to attend a future committee

1 meeting.

2
3 Mr. Wills commented that the key issues for schools on a national level are preventing guns
4 on campus, security and anti-terrorism, and safety, including fires and industrial accidents.

5
6 Ms. Koplin noted the best practices speaker listed 14 major problems that had been
7 identified by schools, and they included access to grants for emergency planning, students
8 leaving campus at lunch, lack of fencing and gates, difficult egress from buildings,
9 accidents and hazards caused by construction, panicky parents and training for parents,
10 communications problems and loss of cellular phone service, gang areas, leaving a main
11 entrance door open all day, vulnerability of students, sheltering, open-air campuses
12 requiring students to walk outside between buildings, and interoperability with local
13 agencies.

14
15 Mr. Reyes reported that the Seismic Safety Commission is undertaking a tsunami study,
16 with the goal of releasing a report by the end of the year. He said the Commission plans to
17 look at tsunami risks in California, identify vulnerable areas, and propose ways of preparing
18 and responding to hazards. He observed that some other countries have found that
19 training children is often an effective way of reaching parents, and he emphasized the
20 importance of public outreach and education to encourage mitigation.

21
22 Ms. Koplin asked Mr. Dan Levernier to add the conference materials and videotape to
23 DSA's library.

24
25 Ms. Koplin expressed her opinion that attendance at the conference was worthwhile, and
26 she encouraged the committee to participate in more workshops next year. She suggested
27 choosing a topic related to school emergency planning or sheltering.

28
29 Mr. Wills said next year's DRC Conference will be held in San Francisco to mark the 100th
30 anniversary of the 1906 earthquake. He noted that although national groups are concerned
31 about things like campus violence and debris clean-up after hurricanes, there are lessons
32 to be learned from those incidents that can be applied to California's earthquake and
33 mudslide responses. Mr. Bate observed that lack of coordination between police and fire
34 and public agencies is a recurring problem in many types of disasters.

35
36 Ms. Koplin noted the focus on the 1906 earthquake will provide an opportunity to highlight
37 seismic safety, which is of great interest to California schools.

38 39 **DSA Emergency Plan Update**

40 Mr. Dan Levernier distributed a proposed schedule of staff training. He reported that Mr.
41 Tony Ferrara, OES, advised that the final draft of the emergency plan was being sent to the
42 printer.

43
44 Mr. Levernier noted DSA's executive staff will receive SEMS training on May 25, and
45 headquarters and regional office people will be trained during the summer. He said DSA
46 technical staff are being trained to conduct safety assessments in the field. A final
47 debriefing meeting on the emergency plan will take place in mid-August.

48
49 Mr. Bate recommended ongoing refresher classes to reinforce the information taught at
50 these training sessions. Mr. Levernier said that once the first round of training is
51 completed, DSA will be looking at follow-ups like drills and refresher courses.

1
2 Mr. Bate suggested working with a local school district to conduct a mock drill. Participants
3 talked about ideas for realistic ways of simulating disaster response situations for the staff.
4
5 Ms. Koplin encouraged committee members to attend the training sessions. Mr. Levernier
6 and Ms. Aguayo offered to make the necessary arrangements.
7
8 Mr. Wills stated that rapid advances are taking place in earthquake damage assessment.
9 He said the California Earthquake Authority maintains a GIS file on each policyholder, and
10 in the event of an earthquake, that data can be used to estimate intensity of shaking can for
11 each location. He noted the California Geological Survey is involved with other state
12 agencies in the state's earthquake emergency clearinghouse, and shake maps and other
13 tools can be used to deploy response resources most efficiently.
14
15 Mr. David Casey commented that it would be helpful to integrate this kind of information
16 with tsunami programs.
17
18 Mr. Reyes said NOAA is producing inundation maps of all of the coastal areas of California,
19 and once that effort is completed, the most vulnerable locations can be identified. He noted
20 most people are concerned about Crescent City and Santa Barbara, but there are other
21 vulnerable places.
22
23 Mr. Bate suggested conferring with the new state architect to get his thoughts on DSA's
24 response to earthquakes and other disasters. Mr. Levernier noted Mr. Thorman planned to
25 stop by later in the meeting.
26
27 Mr. Art Ross asked if the state has enough seismographic instruments to produce accurate
28 shake maps immediately after an event. Mr. Wills noted the existing network has monitors
29 spread throughout the state. He added that the Strong Motion Instrumentation Program
30 would like more funding to produce even better records.
31
32 Mr. Wills described how data from strong motion instruments is disseminated through the
33 California Integrated Seismic Network. Committee members discussed types of strong
34 motion instruments and earthquake warning systems.
35
36 Mr. Bate said the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development installs different
37 kinds of instruments in hospitals depending on the type of structure.
38
39 Ms. Koplin asked if committee members had questions on DSA's emergency plan. She
40 drew attention to the section on emergency management responsibilities, and asked Mr.
41 Levernier to elaborate on the bulleted items.
42
43 In terms of access to building plans, Mr. Levernier said DSA has plans for almost all public
44 school buildings built since 1933. Starting about a year and a half ago, plans and
45 documents have been scanned into the system, and the eventual goal is to have all
46 documents in an electronic format. Mr. Levernier noted the stored documents include
47 original plans and specifications, plus the entire project file, which contains change orders
48 and other notations.
49
50 Ms. Koplin asked if schools are required to maintain as-built drawings, which can be helpful
51 in both emergency response and damage assessment. Mr. Levernier responded that DSA
52 does not require as-built drawings. He noted districts typically keep plans around for a

1 limited number of years.

2
3 Mr. Bate recommended periodically contacting schools to encourage them to keep their
4 plans up to date. He added that some schools engage in extensive modification projects
5 that are not reported to DSA.

6
7 Committee members suggested that DSA accept electronic drawings and documents in a
8 “pdf” format.

9
10 Mr. Levernier welcomed feedback from the committee in terms of the kinds of documents
11 DSA should maintain for school buildings used as shelter facilities. He noted the Building
12 Standards Committee had previously considered requiring higher building standards for
13 schools used as shelters, but that idea was rejected. Mr. Levernier advocated working with
14 local Red Cross chapters and individual school districts to pre-identify buildings to be used
15 as disaster shelters. He added that this is one of the action items previously identified by
16 the committee. He asked the committee to specify what DSA should be doing to further its
17 goals. Ms. Koplin proposed coming back to this topic after lunch.

18
19 Mr. Wills stated that the committee would like the emergency response plan to call out the
20 sites to be used as shelters so they can be the first priorities for structural evaluations after
21 an earthquake.

22
23 Mr. Mike Modugno advocated both a proactive and a reactive approach. He noted the San
24 Diego Red Cross has agreements in place with school districts, and then they pick facilities
25 based on the location and extent of the disaster. He observed that having a list in advance
26 also allows unsuitable buildings to be removed from consideration. He also suggested
27 telling Red Cross to call DSA as soon as possible after a disaster to conduct the necessary
28 structural evaluations of the shelter facilities.

29
30 Ms. Koplin recommended contacting Red Cross chapters that do not have agreements in
31 place and urging them to identify shelter sites in advance.

32
33 Mr. Levernier said these comments were helpful. He suggested compiling a list of follow-
34 up items based on the minutes of this meeting and then prioritizing the list.

35
36 Ms. Aguayo urged the committee to be mindful of the staff’s workload. She recommended
37 following the process identified in her handout to identify and assign tasks.

38
39 Mr. Levernier noted the second bulleted item on Page 14 of the Emergency Plan is being
40 addressed through the staff training program discussed earlier.

41
42 Referring to the third item, regarding general post-disaster safety assessment of state-
43 owned buildings, Mr. Levernier said RESD has responsibility for inspecting state-owned
44 building. He noted that after a disaster, DSA would respond first to schools, and RESD
45 would dispatch staff to state buildings.

46
47 Ms. Koplin commented that the committee’s main concern was ensuring that roles and
48 responsibilities are clear. She noted this should be one of the main tasks identified under
49 preparedness. Mr. Levernier said he believed the emergency plan defined DSA’s and
50 RESD’s responsibilities; he added that he would check to make sure.

51
52 Mr. Bate noted that DSA plans to go ahead with the emergency plan and train its staff, but

1 he asked how school districts will know about the plan. Mr. Levernier said the emergency
2 plan will be posted on the Web site and incorporated in training sessions. Participants
3 recommended publicizing the emergency plan at the next Coalition for Adequate School
4 Housing (CASH) conference.

5
6 Mr. Levernier said the fourth bulleted item is to coordinate with the Department of General
7 Services' (DGS') emergency preparedness manager to ensure proper procedures are in
8 place for agency tasking relating to school assessment missions. Mr. John Ashbee
9 commented that DGS should serve as a communications hub to allocate resources
10 between DSA and RESD and make assignments. Mr. Levernier noted the flow chart in the
11 emergency plan shows that as DGS' role.

12
13 Mr. Levernier encouraged Mr. Ashbee to attend the executive training session on May 25
14 and the state-level workshop on July 14.

15
16 Mr. Levernier noted the last bullet under "Preparedness" talks about ensuring that DSA
17 offices are properly equipped and ready. He said the emergency plan appendix contains a
18 list of required items. He noted the list can be expanded based on lessons learned in
19 hands-on training and drills.

20
21 Ms. Koplin observed that the committee has talked about post-event data collection, and
22 she recommended including that in the emergency plan. Mr. Levernier noted the
23 emergency plan contains forms used for post-disaster evaluation.

24
25 Mr. Levernier reviewed the bullet items under "Response" and noted all items are already
26 being addressed through the emergency plan and the training session.

27
28 Under "Recovery," Mr. Levernier noted DSA provides staff and consultants to conduct
29 detailed structural analyses as needed. He said the ongoing training covers how to
30 account for costs and equipments and prepare after-action reports.

31
32 Mr. Levernier reviewed the two "Mitigation" items and noted both were covered through
33 existing programs.

34
35 At 11:30 a.m., the committee recessed for lunch. Ms. Koplin reconvened the meeting at
36 1:00 p.m.

37 38 **"Seismic Safety in California Schools" Document**

39 Ms. Koplin said committee members received copies of the report with the agenda.

40 41 **Review of Action Items**

42 Ms. Koplin suggested reviewing the staff's April 29, 2005 compilation of active, on-hold,
43 and inactive items from past meetings.

44
45 Ms. Koplin observed that the first item, development of the DSA emergency response plan,
46 is well underway. Mr. Levernier clarified that the document was essentially complete and
47 training had started. He invited committee members to attend training sessions. Ms.
48 Koplin said she was pleased with this accomplishment, and she commended the staff.

49
50 Ms. Koplin noted the second item is adding a local building official to the committee. She
51 welcomed suggestions from committee members. Mr. Bate said he emailed a building

1 official in Santa Rosa but had not yet received a response. He added that he would keep
2 trying and would contact other names on his list.

3
4 Ms. Koplin said the third item, emergency portable building criteria, is currently on hold. Mr.
5 Bate explained that DSA currently has no criteria defining what can be used as a portable
6 building at a school.

7
8 Mr. Levernier noted DSA regulations define relocatable buildings, but there was concern
9 about whether they provide the same level of safety as other buildings. Buildings on
10 concrete foundations can get full approval, while buildings on wood foundations get only
11 conditional approval, but both types are built to the same code. Mr. Levernier said HCD
12 issued criteria allowing modular buildings to be used on school campuses for two years.

13
14 Mr. Bate observed that modular and relocatable buildings are likely to be used on an
15 emergency basis after disasters, and he clarified the committee was looking for assurances
16 that they would be allowed for only a limited time period. Mr. Levernier stated that Policy
17 97-10 allows a two-year temporary use. Ms. Koplin suggested removing that item from the
18 follow-up list.

19
20 Ms. Koplin noted the next follow-up item pertains to coordinating with local emergency
21 responders and having staff attend meetings of police and fire chief associations. Mr.
22 David Casey said some of DSA's regional staff have attended Northern California fire
23 officer meetings. He added that DSA people are networking and establishing relationships
24 with these organizations. Committee members concluded that this item was being
25 addressed.

26
27 Ms. Koplin suggested adding local agencies in the emergency plan section on inter-agency
28 coordination. She drew attention to Item 07.01.22 on Page 3 of the follow-up list. Mr.
29 Levernier noted the flow chart will take a bit more research to clarify the roles and
30 relationships of each entity. Mr. Bate pointed out that the goal of both items is better
31 coordination among agencies.

32
33 Mr. Levernier proposed combining Items 07.01.10 and 07.01.22 to advocate more research
34 and education on the roles of the different agencies. Committee members expressed
35 support for this approach.

36
37 Mr. Bate recommended contacting State Fire Marshal Ruben Grijalva, advising him that
38 DSA was working on a number of issues pertaining to fire safety, and urging him to have a
39 representative attend committee meetings. Ms. Koplin observed that this fits in well with
40 Item 07.01.13, and she suggested combining that with 07.01.10 as well.

41
42 Ms. Koplin noted the first item on Page 2 is to review the LAUSD emergency plan when it is
43 complete. She suggested contacting LAUSD to find out when the document will be
44 available, noting it could be very informative for the committee. Committee members
45 expressed interest in reviewing the plan. Ms. Koplin offered to contact LAUSD to
46 determine the status of the plan. She also proposed inviting someone from LAUSD to
47 make a presentation on the emergency plan at a future meeting.

48
49 Ms. Koplin noted Item 07.01.17 is to invite someone from Alameda County to make a
50 presentation on their emergency plan. She said she believed Mr. Lowell Shields was going
51 to invite a representative to an Advisory Board meeting, so that item is being addressed.

52 Ms. Aguayo added that she would check with Mr. Shields.

1
2 Ms. Koplin said Item 07.01.20 pertains to emergency supply bin criteria. Noting that this
3 topic ties in with the sheltering issue, she suggested discussing it in conjunction with
4 07.02.01 on Page 3. Mr. Bate expressed support for providing better guidance to schools
5 in both areas. Ms. Koplin noted the committee learned at the last meeting that the
6 California Department of Education has no criteria for siting the bins and ensuring they are
7 properly stocked. Committee members mentioned problems where emergency bins are
8 located under power lines or blocking exits, and there was general consensus that criteria
9 should be provided to school districts. Ms. Koplin said that at the present time, DSA
10 recommends that schools should be prepared to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours, and
11 that a list of emergency bin contents be provided.

12
13 Ms. Koplin noted some school districts are developing their own criteria, and she reviewed
14 some of the guidelines provided by a conference presenter from Berkeley.

15
16 Mr. Levernier said the staff will need to gather existing documents to compile draft
17 guidelines. He asked whether the guidance should be sent to certain areas of the state or
18 all school districts. Committee members recommended sending the information to every
19 school district.

20
21 Mr. Bate volunteered to look at the Sunnyvale Red Cross' memorandum of understanding
22 documents. Ms. Koplin offered to contact LAUSD for their materials. She suggested
23 asking Berkeley as well.

24
25 Committee members agreed that emergency supply bin item should remain active. She
26 proposed that she and Mr. Bate bring further information back to the staff and committee.

27 28 **Introduction of New State Architect**

29 Mr. Levernier introduced State Architect David Thorman. Ms. Koplin welcomed him to the
30 meeting.

31
32 Mr. Thorman said he was pleased and excited about the committee's activities and
33 expressed his full support. He stated that his background includes work in both design and
34 construction of schools. He invited committee members to call him directly to discuss any
35 problems or concerns.

36
37 Mr. Levernier explained that the committee was in the process of reviewing and clarifying
38 action items and determining priorities. He said once that process is complete, DSA can
39 make staffing decisions.

40
41 Ms. Koplin noted one of the primary reasons the committee was formed was to assist DSA
42 in developing an emergency plan, a task that is now near completion. She said the
43 committee is beginning to focus on other issues pertaining to school emergency
44 preparedness and planning.

45
46 Mr. Bate asked Mr. Thorman if he agreed with the direction the committee was going. Mr.
47 Thorman responded that he endorsed the committee's activities. He recommended giving
48 thought to issues of school safety and security as well as disaster response. Ms. Koplin
49 observed that the committee had been discussing those issues earlier in the morning. She
50 noted that in some cases, school security measures can conflict with evacuation and exit
51 plans for fire and earthquake response. She emphasized the need to coordinate security

1 and safety efforts, one of the points raised at the DRC Conference.

2
3 Ms. Koplin noted Mr. Wills will be making a presentation on earthquake monitoring and
4 tsunami warning technology that could be helpful in emergency planning.

5
6 **Review of Action Items (Continued)**

7 Ms. Koplin drew attention to Item 07.01.21, regarding the tagging process. She noted the
8 committee concluded a year or so ago that DSA lacked statutory authority to tag buildings.
9 As a result, legislation was introduced to clarify DSA's roles and authority. She asked if the
10 staff felt there was a need for additional clarification.

11
12 Mr. Levernier expressed his opinion that it would be helpful to spell out DSA's tagging
13 authority. He said that instead of passing the legislation a couple years ago, DSA decided
14 to handle the matter administratively, and an administrative order was issued confirming
15 DSA's tagging authority. He suggested checking with legal counsel to see if all pertinent
16 issues have been addressed.

17
18 Mr. Ross noted that in the past, DSA thought OES was responsible for tagging schools,
19 and OES thought DSA was doing the tagging. He recommended entering into an
20 interagency agreement with OES to establish a process for looking at schools. Mr.
21 Levernier said the staff will clarify the process with OES.

22
23 Ms. Koplin said that when she attended an ATC-20 training session, inspectors were under
24 the impression that they could skip public schools because DSA would be handling those
25 inspections. She recommended clarifying DSA's legal authority.

26
27 Mr. Levernier said he would look into this issue. He noted DSA inspectors have been
28 performing damage assessments of school buildings, but not necessarily the tagging. He
29 observed that if DSA is responsible for tagging schools, there should be an ample supply of
30 tags available at the office.

31
32 Ms. Koplin proposed keeping this item active and assigning it to the staff for follow-up.

33
34 Mr. Modugno commented that the 1995 OES publication, "Schools as Post-Disaster
35 Shelters," contains some conflicting information on roles and responsibilities. He
36 recommended that the staff check with OES to make sure it reflects the latest policies and
37 practices.

38
39 Ms. Koplin said the staff does not know whether the OES document was ever distributed.
40 Mr. Levernier stated that Mr. Tony Ferraro indicated OES no longer supports the program,
41 but the publication still contains useful information. Mr. Ferraro endorsed the idea of
42 working with DSA to update the material. Mr. Levernier added that Mr. Ferraro questioned
43 DSA's tagging authority, so it would be wise to clarify the point.

44
45 Ms. Koplin noted the committee has met with Red Cross and school district representatives
46 to gain an understanding of school districts' responsibilities pertaining to sheltering after
47 emergencies. The committee also looked at some of the sheltering problems that occurred
48 after the Northridge earthquake. Ms. Koplin said there is a general understanding that all
49 school sites can be used as emergency shelters, and the Red Cross has authority to select
50 which sites are used. Red Cross representatives indicated that shelter buildings are not
51 evaluated for safety, and selection is based on the facilities available at each site. The

1 committee had concern about the lack of structural safety evaluations and recommended
2 pre-identifying suitable and unsuitable sites. The committee also questioned whether
3 school districts have made adequate emergency plans to house their students and staff
4 along with large numbers of people.

5
6 Ms. Koplin noted the committee is still looking at the overall issue of sheltering and
7 coordination among agencies.

8
9 Mr. Ross proposed recommending a Red Cross memorandum to require post-earthquake
10 inspections of shelter building before they can be occupied. He noted this step can help
11 avoid damage and injury that could result from later aftershocks..

12
13 Mr. Levernier said the current Education Code gives Red Cross the authority to use any
14 school building they want. Ms. Koplin noted the law also requires school districts to
15 develop an emergency plan in coordination with their local agencies' response plans. She
16 commented that sheltering is not addressed in many schools' emergency plans. She read
17 excerpts from the code indicating that schools are responsible for the safety of their
18 students, and Red Cross is responsible for the general population in shelters.

19
20 Mr. Levernier identified three follow-up items proposed by the committee: to have buildings
21 evaluated as shelters before an event; give priority to evaluating buildings used as shelters
22 after an event; and update the OES document regarding schools as disaster shelters.

23
24 Mr. Modugno noted the OES document is the best example the committee has seen, and
25 he suggested using it as a basis for developing updated guidelines. Ms. Koplin suggested
26 involving CDE in dissemination of the document to school districts.

27
28 Ms. Koplin asked committee members to review the document and come back with
29 comments at the next meeting.

30
31 Mr. Levernier said the staff will compile a list of follow-up items, come back to the
32 committee for direction and prioritization, and then evaluate staffing and resources
33 available for each task. Ms. Koplin observed that the shelter issue impacts the lives of
34 students and members of the public. She urged DSA to give this a high priority in terms of
35 staffing and workload.

36
37 Ms. Koplin drew attention to Item 07.02.02, regarding building assessment criteria,
38 including pre- and post-event criteria. Mr. Levernier reported that the staff is receiving
39 training in damage assessment methodologies; he asked if this item was still needed. Ms.
40 Koplin said the committee had expressed concern about data collection after the Northridge
41 earthquake. Lessons learned after that earthquake led to introduction of new building code
42 provisions and regulations on a number of topics, and the committee wanted to make sure
43 this kind of data was recorded.

44
45 Mr. Levernier said DSA uses damage assessment forms to enter data in a database, and
46 then that information can be used to identify the need for code changes. He noted the
47 ongoing training process will cover this area.

48
49 Mr. Casey commented that it would be helpful to prioritize buildings in advance so the most
50 appropriate facilities can be used first as shelters. He suggested a rating system that
51 includes structural safety, fire access, proximity to public transportation, and other
52 important factors. Committee members noted this relates back to the previous item on

1 schools as shelters.

2
3 Mr. Ross commented that pre-identification of buildings presents some political problems.
4 For example, he noted, parents are likely to question the safety of a school rejected as a
5 shelter but still occupied by students. He advocated using post-earthquake performance
6 rather than just life safety to select buildings used as shelters.

7
8 Ms. Koplin suggested assigning development of assessment criteria to DSA; she proposed
9 that the committee continue working on performance criteria for schools used as shelters.
10 Mr. Reyes observed that DSA has similar criteria for evaluating non-Field Act structures for
11 possible use as schools.

12
13 Mr. Levernier questioned whether DSA should be developing non-code-based criteria. Mr.
14 Ross said he thought DSA could develop performance criteria to evaluate use of buildings
15 in post-earthquake scenarios. He agreed that going to performance criteria will not be
16 easy, but expressed his opinion it was the correct direction for the state to be moving. After
17 some discussion, the committee agreed it would be worthwhile to proceed with
18 performance criteria. Mr. Levernier said the staff will look into how that can be done.

19
20 Mr. Ross made a motion to recommend that the chair of the DSA Advisory Board write a
21 letter to the Seismic Safety Commission enlisting their help on this issue. Mr. Bate noted
22 SEAOC would be in a better position to provide assistance. Mr. Reyes advocated working
23 with the engineering community. Mr. Ross withdrew the motion.

24
25 Mr. Bate commented that the IBC is a more performance-based code, so that may be
26 where California should go. Mr. Reyes noted peer review is a critical component.

27
28 Ms. Koplin suggested keeping building assessment on the list and clarifying that the
29 committee will focus on performance-based evaluation of school buildings in post-
30 earthquake scenarios. There was general consensus supporting that approach.

31
32 Ms. Aguayo asked for clarification as to whether the committee's effort should be limited to
33 post-earthquake scenarios or all disasters. Ms. Koplin recommended concentrating on
34 earthquakes. Mr. Bate agreed, noting other disasters do not have as much impact on
35 structural conditions.

36
37 Mr. Levernier indicated that if sufficient staff is available, it would be beneficial to work with
38 OES to update the publication, ask Red Cross chapters to identify specific shelter
39 candidates, and then target those buildings for first priority in post-earthquake evaluations.

40
41 Ms. Koplin drew attention to 07.02.03, to request OES and ORC mailing lists. She said she
42 did not recall the reason for that item and proposed eliminating it from the list.

43
44 Referring to Item 07.02.05, school district safety plans, Ms. Koplin noted a motion was
45 forwarded to the Board that DSA write to OES regarding integration of school district safety
46 plans with plans of local municipalities. She suggested that merging this item with the
47 follow-up regarding LAUSD. She observed that this item also relates to emergency bins
48 and sheltering. She recommended reviewing the CDE guidelines as part of this item.

49
50 Ms. Koplin noted the next item, pertaining to literature search, was covered under the
51 sheltering initiative; Item 07.02.07, the final report from the Seismic Safety Commission,
52 was completed; and Item 07.02.08 was addressed through Mr. Ashbee's presence.

1
2 Ms. Koplin suggested reviewing and prioritizing the remaining action items. Mr. Levernier
3 reviewed the action items reflected in his notes. He said 07.01.10, Local Emergency
4 Responders, will be combined with 07.01.13 and 07.01.22, all of which deal with
5 coordination of roles and responsibilities among agencies.

6
7 Ms. Aguayo noted safety plans of school districts in 07.02.05 will be merged with the
8 LAUSD item, 07.01.11. Mr. Ross pointed out that 07.02.01 and 07.01.20 are similar; Ms.
9 Aguayo proposed combining those separately.

10
11 Regarding Item 07.02.03, Mr. Bate clarified that the committee wanted to make sure DSA
12 and OES were using appropriate mailing lists for school districts. Mr. Levernier suggested
13 deferring this task until there was something to mail. Committee members agreed to put
14 this item on hold.

15
16 Mr. Levernier said emergency supply bin criteria, schools as shelters, and the tagging issue
17 were the remaining items.

18
19 He noted DSA will follow up on three issues: coordination and relationships among
20 agencies, criteria for emergency supply bins and shelters, and tagging process. Committee
21 members recommended clarifying the tagging process as the first priority.

22
23 **Ms. Koplin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bate, to recommend that DSA focus on**
24 **clarifying legal authority for tagging as its main priority. The motion was carried**
25 **unanimously.**

26
27 Ms. Koplin said the committee will continue to work on the remaining items.

28 29 **Meeting Summary/Next Steps**

30 Ms. Koplin asked committee members to review the OES publication on schools as
31 shelters and bring comments to the next meeting. She said she would check on the status
32 of the LAUSD emergency plan and provide copies if available.

33
34 Ms. Aguayo offered to scan the OES document and email it to committee members as an
35 electronic file. Ms. Koplin asked the staff to scan and disseminate Mr. Ashbee's documents
36 as well.

37
38 Ms. Koplin proposed that the committee start thinking about developing a workshop and
39 information for school districts for next year's DRC Conference in San Francisco. She
40 asked the staff to include this item on the follow-up list.

41 42 **Public Comments**

43 There were no members of the public who wished to address the committee.

44 45 **New Business**

46 There were no items of new business discussed by the committee.

47 48 **Schedule Next Meeting**

49 Ms. Koplin noted the LAUSD plan is supposed to be completed in June, and she suggested

1 scheduling a committee meeting sometime after that. Ms. Aguayo said the Board will be
2 meeting on July 21.

3
4 After some discussion, committee members tentatively decided to schedule the next
5 meeting for Wednesday, September 14, 2005. Ms. Koplin proposed holding the meeting in
6 Los Angeles and touring the new Los Angeles County EOC facility. Committee members
7 noted Los Angeles would be a good location for a presentation from LAUSD officials. Ms.
8 Koplin suggested inviting the entire Board to attend the meeting and tour.

9
10 **Adjournment**

11 Ms. Koplin thanked all participants for attending. There being no further business, the
12 Safety and Emergency Response Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.